



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

K

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,243	04/03/2000	Arthur W. Wang	PD-990212	4723

20991 7590 09/18/2003

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION
BLDG 001 M/S A109
P O BOX 956
EL SEGUNDO, CA 902450956

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHI Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/542,243

Applicant(s)

WANG, ARTHUR W.

Examiner

Chi Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The receipt of appeal brief is acknowledged. And upon further consideration, the previous Final Office action is withdrawn. With new art and new ground of rejections are presented as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Times of London Article (TL) in view of Oliver (US 6,166,329) and McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912).

In regard to claims 21, 18-20, Times of London Article teaches Today Homes with latest technology at Langley Park, Beckenham, Kent, is built by Laing Homes and is pre-wired to run a network of computers, satellite, and digital TV and CCTV (see attachment in paragraph 2). The Article does not teach specifically the satellite wires positioned adjacent to the plurality of studs and coupled to drywall layer and having first, second terminations, radome enclosing the first termination, a connector coupled to the second termination. Oliver discloses a building pre-wired for electrical outlets including a plurality of studs 40, electrical wires 18 adjacent to studs 40, connector 10, a drywall 42 encloses from therein (figs. 3A, 3B).

McDonald discloses building wired for satellite 22 communication including wires (18,30) that connect the roof mounted antennae on the roof to outlets 18', 30' in the wall thus providing terminations for the wire outside the building, where wire terminating within the antenna and inside the building, where wire terminating to the connectors (TV, computer, etc.). Outlets tend to be standardized for use such as electrical or phone. Figure 3 of McDonald shows a standardized phone jack (32). This is considered to be a "universal connector". And DeMarre teaches a profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a radome 104, a satellite wire 113 terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator) of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the radome 104 (see figs. 1-2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Time of London Article with Oliver's for the plurality of studs and drywall adjacent to the pre-wiring and with McDonald for satellite antenna connections and with DeMarre for antenna enclosing by the radome 104. The motivation for substituting the Time of London Article with Oliver's pre-wiring adjacent to the plurality of studs and drywall and with McDonald's satellite wire and DeMarre would have been to provide today latest technology into new build homes or business buildings capable to access for satellite signal for uses of TV, Internet service, cellular phone, etc. However, DeMarre does not teach specifically the radome enclosed the antenna and also the first termination, examiner considers this would have been obvious matter of rearranging parts of an invention that involves only routine skill in the art. The motivation for doing would have been to protect the connection from UV radiation or water damage.

In regard to claims 19-20, combining different function jacks into one connector plate is well known in the wiring and would be obvious for The Times of London Article and Oliver's structures as modified by McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide users able to connect into different sources such as telephone line, TV, internet services, etc. at the same connector without a need of routing wires to another terminal.

4. Claims 21-23, 25, 27, 29-39, 41-43, and 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Times of London Article in view of Oliver (US 6,166,329) and McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912).

The Times of London Article, Oliver, McDonald disclose the structural elements for having today homes with latest technology for satellite cable ready except for a radome enclosing a flat satellite and positioned within low-profile sized, color match a roof randome. DeMarre teaches a low profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a radome 104, a satellite wire 113 terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator) of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the radome 104. And the other end of the satellite wire 113 is inherently terminating to other connector (second terminator); the antenna 100 is mounted to a planar surface or the exterior surface of a building (col. 3, line 36-54, col. 6, line 21-42). 4. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine The Times of London Article, Oliver's, McDonald's with DeMarre teaching for low profile bi-directional antenna enclosing within the radome. The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide satellite wire ready

Art Unit: 3635

and conveniently for home and office uses, protecting the antenna from UV light and to match the roof color for cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof. With regard to claims 29-37, 39, 41-43, and 57-64, The Times of London Article, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready as stated except for the satellite wires having a third, a fourth terminations, a second connector coupled to the fourth termination, a second radome enclosing the third termination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have more than one radomes and satellite wires connecting to more than one terminations, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working device involves only routine in the art. *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide every building unit capable to access satellite signals.

With regards to the claim 34 the universal connector comprises a LAN (Local Area Network) jack, examiner considers McDonald or DeMarre inherently teaches this because most of satellite wires are connecting to TV service and Internet service as so-called as network.

5. Claims 24, 40, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Times of London Article in view of Oliver (US 6,166,329) and McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Radov (US 4,710,778). The Times of London Article, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for pre-wiring satellite cable ready for units of building as stated except for the radome have a color to substantially match a surface color of the roof.

Art Unit: 3635

Radov teaches satellite earth station comprises a satellite 11, house roof 12, antenna 16 enclosing by a canopy or radome 40. The canopy or radome is made by strong lightweight plastic capable of transmitting high frequency microwave signals with a minimum of interference. While the plastic is preferable clear, it may be opaque and of a color to match the color of the roof 12 (col. 4, lines 21-25).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine The Times of London Article, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre with Radov for the radome color match the roof color. The suggestion for doing so would have been to enhance the cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof.

6. Claims 26, 28, 38, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Times of London Article in view of Oliver (6,166,329) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Spano (US 6,204,823) and Iwamura (US 5,940,028).

The Times of London Article, Oliver and DeMarre disclose the structural elements for satellite cable ready for buildings except for antenna having remote control for positioning and variable-inclination mechanism. Spano teaches an elevation drive mechanism is mounted on the support plate and interconnects the antenna for pivoting the antenna a predetermined angle and adjusting elevation of the antenna (see abstract). And Iwamura teaches system and method for aligning an antenna including a remote control 15, and antenna 1 (see fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine The Times of London Article, Oliver, DeMarre with Spano and Iwamura for inclination mechanism and

antenna remote control. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the antenna receiving the strong signal at any angle.

7. Claims 45-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Times of London Article in view of Oliver (US 6,166,329) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Spano (US 6,204,823) and Iwamura (US 5,940,028).

With regard to the method claims, Oliver, DeMarre, Spano and Iwamura teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready except for the method of assembly or installation, examiner considers this to be the obvious method of setting up the device of claims because in pre-wiring for homes, one must obviously routing wires (satellite, electrical, etc.) adjacent plurality of studs, determine all connections through out the house, enclose drywalls, connect outer termination into the antenna, cover with a radome. The Times of London Article along with Oliver, DeMarre, Spano, and Iwamura would be motivated to follow these steps to facilitate assembly to provide satellite signals for house or commercial building, etc.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached at (703) 308-0839. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/542,243
Art Unit: 3635

Page 8

CQN
9/10/03

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carl D. Friedman', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600